Exhibit UNE-1

CURRICULA VITAE FOR UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS PANELISTS

I. MARGARET DETCH

Before working for Verizon, Ms. Detch was employed as a Market Analyst/Consultant for a small private research firm. She specialized in analyzing the consumer market for wireless devices (*i.e.*, cellular, paging, vehicle location devices, etc.) and consulting with the manufacturers and vendors of such devices. Ms. Detch has been employed by Verizon and its predecessor companies since 1993, when she was assigned to Verizon Mobile to provide market analysis and support for a number of pricing, product and service initiatives. I joined the Wholesale marketing organization in May 1995.

II. SUSAN FOX

Ms. Fox has 18 years of experience in telecommunications, as an employee of Verizon and its predecessor companies, including AT&T and Bell Communications Research, Inc. ("Bellcore"). She joined Bell Atlantic Network Services in 1987. Prior to assuming her current position in February 2000, Ms. Fox was the Product Manager for Interstate Switched Access from 1995 through 1999.

III. STEVE GABRIELLI

Mr. Gabrielli has more than 23 years experience in the telecommunications industry in a variety of data processing, ordering, billing, and Product Management positions working for Contel, GTE and now Verizon. Prior to the merger he was responsible for UNE

Product ordering and billing implementation for all UNE products for the former GTE company. Mr. Gabrielli assumed my current position in October 2000.

III. NANCY GILLIGAN

Ms. Gilligan has more than 22 years experience in the telecommunications industry. During that time she has held positions of increasing responsibility in Outside Plant Engineering, Network Planning and Access Services Product Management. Ms. Gilligan received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Mathematics and Economics from Boston College in 1978, and a Master of Business Administration degree from Boston College in 1985.

IV. RICHARD ROUSEY

Mr. Rousey has over 25 years of experience with former GTE and Verizon. He has been developing CLEC-oriented products in Wholesale Service Marketing since 1996 and have helped introduce such products as Interim Number Portability, Local Number Portability, Unbundled Loops, Unbundled Sub-Loops, Line Sharing, Exhanced Extended Links, Unbundled Network Interface Devices and Remote Terminal Collocation. Prior to his present position, Mr. Rousey had held various positions with increasing responsibility within the Wholesale Organization as well as both the Consumer and Business Organizations.

V. ALICE SHOCKET

Ms. Shocket has been employed by Verizon and its predecessors for more than thirty years. During that time she has held various jobs in the customer service, regulatory and marketing departments. Ms. Shocket assumed my current position as Product Manager in

Wholesale Markets in 1996 where she has been responsible for all aspect of the deployment and implementation of Local Number Portability.

Verizon Exhibit 2

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of Petition of WorldCom, Inc. Pursuant to Section 252(e)(5) of the Communications Act for Expedited Preemption of the Jurisdiction of the Virginia State Corporation Commission Regarding Interconnection Disputes with Verizon Virginia Inc., and for Expedited Arbitration	)	CC Docket No. 00-218
In the Matter of Petition of Cox Virginia Telecom, Inc., etc.	)	CC Docket No. 00-249
In the Matter of Petition of AT&T Communications of Virginia Inc., etc.	)	CC Docket No. 00-251

VERIZON VA'S DIRECT TESTIMONY ON NON-MEDIATION ISSUES

(CATEGORIES I AND III THROUGH VII)

ADVANCED SERVICES

•ROSMARIE CLAYTON
•PAUL RICHARD
•RICHARD ROUSEY
•JOHN WHITE

JULY 31, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Yes. I have testified before Commissions in Massachusetts, Washington, D.C., Texas, California, and Pennsylvania.

B. PAUL RICHARD

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Paul Richard. My business address is 500 Summit Lake Drive, Valhalla, NY.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I employed by Verizon as a Senior Specialist in the Wholesale Services Marketing Organization. I am responsible for Product Development and Management of new advanced data services for use by Verizon's CLEC customers. I have been responsible for developing CLEC-oriented products in Wholesale Services Marketing since 1996, and have introduced such products as Unbundled Local Switching, Unbundled Sub-loops and Remote Terminal (RT) Collocation.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.

A. My educational background and experience are described in my curriculum vitae attached as Exhibit ASP-1.

Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY BEFORE ANY OTHER REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?

A. Yes, I have previously testified in New York, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California.

C. RICHARD ROUSEY

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Richard Rousey. My business address is 600 Hidden Ridge Blvd. Irving, Texas.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by Verizon as a Senior Specialist in the Wholesale Services Organization. I am currently responsible for product development and management of new advanced service for use by Verizon's CLEC customers.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.

A. My educational background and experience is described in my curriculum vitae attached as Exhibit ASP-1.

Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY BEFORE ANY OTHER REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?

A. Yes. I have testified in California.

D. JOHN WHITE

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is John White and my business address is 1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am an Executive Director within Verizon's Wholesale Services organization, reporting to the Network Services Department. I am responsible for technical support of wholesale services with a focus on the digital offerings such as xDSL, Line Sharing, and Line Splitting for both existing and proposed products. This support includes issues involving technology standards, planning, engineering, preorder, provisioning, and maintenance.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE IN THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY.

A. My educational background and experience is described in my curriculum vitae attached as Exhibit ASP-1.

Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY BEFORE ANY OTHER REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?

A. Yes. I have previously testified in various dockets in Maryland, New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania.

II. PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW OF PANEL TESTIMONY

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE ADVANCED SERVICES PANEL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. The purpose of the panel's testimony is to:

(1) State Verizon Virginia's ("Verizon VA") position on Issue III-10 relating to line sharing and line splitting and Issues V-6 and IV-28 relating to access to loops where Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier (NGDLC) or Integrated Digital Loop Carrier (IDLC) has been deployed;

(2) Demonstrate why the Commission should adopt the contract language proposed by Verizon VA regarding line sharing and line splitting over copper loops and access to the High Frequency Portion of the Loop (HFPL) where the loop is served by fiber;

(3) Explain why Verizon VA's current network cannot support AT&T's and WorldCom's requests for "line sharing" over fiber-fed loops and access to loops where NGDLC has been deployed;

(4) Discuss deficiencies in AT&T and WorldCom's proposed contract language for line sharing and line splitting over copper loops, "line sharing" over fiber-fed loops, and access to loops where NGDLC has been deployed; and

(5) Explain the operational and technical efficiency problems associated with CLEC-provided line cards (a/k/a "plug and play") sought by AT&T and WorldCom.

The Panel also sponsors the following Exhibits:

- Exhibit ASP-1 - Curriculum Vitae of Panel
- Exhibit ASP-2 - Verizon Line Sharing Over Copper Option 1
- Exhibit ASP-3 - Verizon Line Sharing Over Copper Option 2
- Exhibit ASP-4 - Line Splitting Over Copper: Current View
- Exhibit ASP-5 - Line Splitting Over Copper: Future View – DLEC Line Sharing Converts to VLEC w/ DLEC Data
- Exhibit ASP-6 - Line Splitting Over Copper: Future View – VLEC Migrates UNEP to Add DLEC Data
- Exhibit ASP-7 - Generic Digital Loop Carrier Design
- Exhibit ASP-8 - Typical Remote Terminal Architecture
- Exhibit ASP-9 - NGDLC With Separate Voice and Data Transport
- Exhibit ASP-10 - Sub-loop Interconnection Arrangement

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE ADVANCED SERVICES ISSUES.

A. With respect to issue III-10, the issues are as follows:

- Verizon VA's proposed contract language to both AT&T and WorldCom implements line sharing and line splitting over all copper loops in a nondiscriminatory and commercially reasonable manner consistent with its requirements under the *UNE Remand, Line Sharing and Line Sharing Reconsideration Orders*. Verizon VA's line splitting proposal is the result of an industry-wide collaborative initiated by the New York Commission in which both AT&T and WorldCom participate. Both parties are also currently participating in an implementation pilot in New York. This Commission has already approved of Verizon VA's line sharing and line splitting proposals, and thus those same proposals should be adopted in the AT&T and WorldCom interconnection agreements.

- The Commission has twice found that Verizon VA's proposed language provides nondiscriminatory access to OSS pre-ordering functions associated with determining whether a loop is capable of supporting xDSL technologies, and thus should be adopted. Verizon VA agrees that AT&T should not be required to pre-qualify a loop that has already been pre-qualified for the same advanced data service in the same time period (*i.e.* the loop has been in continuous use for the same service). Pre-qualification for one type of advanced data service, however, does not automatically pre-qualify that loop

for another type of advanced data service or guarantee that the same loop will still be qualified sometime later if the original service has been discontinued, because the network might have been upgraded or changed in the interim. Thus, pre-qualification of loops already providing advanced services is necessary, just and reasonable.

- Verizon VA is not now—and should never be—required to purchase splitters on behalf of AT&T and WorldCom. Purchasing is not a UNE; AT&T and WorldCom each have their own purchasing departments and are perfectly capable of buying their own equipment.

- As a matter of law, CLECs cannot require an ILEC to place splitters in any particular place. Under federal law, the ILEC, not the CLEC, has the right to determine where equipment is collocated in the ILEC's facilities.

- Verizon VA and AT&T have reached agreement on the provisioning interval for line sharing. The parties are still negotiating the intervals for collocation augments necessary to support line sharing, and may be able to resolve this issue.

- Cross-connects between CLECs are not necessary for access to UNEs or interconnection. The Commission already has sought comment on whether there is any basis for re-establishing its vacated cross-connect rule and it

would be wasteful to consider that issue in this arbitration proceeding. Section 224 of the Act does not provide independent authority for CLEC-to-CLEC cross connects. While not required to do so, Verizon VA has agreed to permit CLEC-to-CLEC cross connections in collocation space pending the Commission's ruling on remand.

- The method proposed by AT&T and WorldCom to access the HFPL where Verizon VA has deployed fiber goes beyond the Act and the Commission's requirements. Moreover, their proposals raise a number of serious technical and operational issues that must be evaluated before the proposals could be implemented. Verizon VA's contract language provides access to the HFPL where fiber has been deployed in a manner that satisfies the requirements of the Commission rules. While the Commission has recognized that there may be other ways in which "line sharing" might be implemented where there is fiber in the loop, it has not mandated any particular method. Instead, the Commission initiated further proceedings to address the various methods by which CLECs can access the unbundled high frequency portion of the loop where an ILEC has deployed fiber in the loop (*e.g.*, where the loop is served through a fiber-fed digital loop carrier (DLC) at a remote terminal). Because AT&T and WorldCom's proposals would have an industry-wide impact, principles of administrative efficiency and fair process dictate that this issue should be litigated in the pending rulemaking, not in the context of an interconnection agreement arbitration involving only four parties.

With respect to Issue V-6, AT&T seeks to impose unbundling requirements for fiber-fed loops beyond those of the Act and Commission rules. The term "Next Generation Digital Loop Carrier," has various meaning, and it is unclear to Verizon VA precisely to what AT&T seeks access. The Commission should reject AT&T's attempt to bypass current rules and the Commission's newly initiated rulemaking proceeding on this very issue. AT&T's attempts to require Verizon VA to deploy a new architecture under certain circumstances (and thereby subsidize its business plans) are inconsistent with the Act, and must be rejected. AT&T likewise seeks to expand the definition of a loop beyond that adopted by the Commission.

Similarly, in Issue IV-28, WorldCom seeks the ability to collocate "DSLAMs or other DSL equipment" at the RT where IDLC (a type of NGDLC) has been deployed. Issues IV-28 and V-6 provide another example of both WorldCom and AT&T's attempts to implement a particular method of getting access to the HFPL served by fiber-fed digital loop carrier immediately, ignoring the technical and operational implications of their proposals and pre-judging the results of the Commission's further proceedings to address the various methods by which CLECs may be able to access the HFPL where an ILEC has deployed fiber in the loop. Verizon VA's contract language permits AT&T and WorldCom to access the HFPL served by DLC equipment in compliance with the Commission's rules. Rather than predetermining the outcome of various rulemaking addressing these issues, the Commission should reject the language proposed by AT&T and

WorldCom relating to unbundled access to loops served by NGDLC. Under Verizon VA's proposed language, AT&T and WorldCom will automatically get the benefit of the Commission's consideration of these issues—they will just not be able to preempt it.

III. LINE SHARING OVER COPPER

(Issue III-10)

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE VERIZON VA'S UNBUNDLED LINE SHARING PRODUCT OFFERING.

A. Unbundled Line Sharing provides CLECs access to and use of the high frequency portion of an existing loop to transport data over that same line using xDSL technologies that have been deemed to be acceptable by the Commission, while the ILEC provides voice services on the low frequency portion of the same physical loop.

In accordance with Commission requirements, Verizon VA's proposed contract language[2] provides unbundled access to the HFPL to only a single requesting DLEC, for use over the same physical loop as the analog voice service (POTS) provided by Verizon VA. Verizon VA offers two line sharing splitter arrangements for line sharing over copper loops. Option 1 (*see* Exhibit ASP-2) provides a CLEC with the ability to install, own, and maintain the splitter in its own collocation space within the customer's serving end office. In this scenario, the CLEC provides two cables: a cable for data connection and a cable for voice

[2] *See* Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T § 11.2.17; Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to WorldCom § 4 of UNE Attachment.

and data. Verizon VA provides a loop with Voice and Data capabilities to the CLEC splitter. Upon leaving the splitter, the voice traffic will be passed back to the main distribution frame (MDF) so that Verizon VA may provide voice service to the end user. From that point, data traffic is passed from the DLEC to the DLEC's customer (an ISP or end user).

The CLEC splitter may be installed as part of an initial or subsequent physical collocation application. When the splitter is to be installed as part of an initial physical collocation implementation, the cable termination may be ordered as part of the initial physical collocation application. When a splitter and associated cable and frame termination are to be installed as part of an existing physical collocation arrangement, augments are required and the cable terminations may be ordered through a physical collocation augment application. The CLEC must provide Verizon VA with the required cables. Standard collocation application and augment procedures and rates apply.

In Option 2 (*see* Exhibit ASP-3), Verizon installs a CLEC-owned splitter in Verizon VA space. Verizon VA maintains this splitter. In this scenario, the Verizon VA installed splitter will be placed in a relay rack in a virtual collocation arrangement with connections to the MDF. The splitters are placed within the Central Office at a location determined by engineers by taking into account optimum space utilization. Three cables are required for this scenario. First, a cable is routed for data from the splitter shelf to the CLEC's digital subscriber line

access multiplexer (DSLAM). A second cable connects from the splitter to the MDF which carries voice and data traffic to the splitter. Finally, a third cable connects from the splitter to the MDF so that voice traffic may be returned to Verizon VA after it leaves the CLEC splitter, so that Verizon VA may provide the voice service. The CLEC must provide Verizon VA with approved splitters, splitter shelves, and cables. The splitter shelf and components are installed on a shelf-at-a-time basis. The CLEC does not have physical access to the installed splitters or to the MDF.

These two arrangements satisfy Verizon VA's obligations to provide nondiscriminatory access to the HFPL.

Verizon VA has established terms and conditions for making this UNE available through the two described splitter scenarios at rates and charges which are intended to enable Verizon VA to recover the incremental costs of installing and maintaining Line Sharing as a UNE.

IV. LINE SPLITTING OVER COPPER

(Issue III-10)

Q. DO CLECS CURRENTLY HAVE THE ABILITY TO ENGAGE IN LINE SPLITTING IN VERIZON VA TERRITORY?

A. Yes. As depicted in Exhibit ASP-4, CLECs can currently provide line splitting utilizing existing Commission defined UNEs—that is, where the CLEC purchases the entire xDSL-capable loop and provides its own splitter. This scenario is available today and does not require any operations support systems (OSS)

modifications by Verizon VA. CLECs may utilize existing supporting OSS to order and combine in a line splitting configuration an unbundled xDSL capable loop terminated to an appropriately collocated splitter and DSLAM equipment provided by a participating CLEC, and unbundled switching terminated to its collocation arrangement combined with shared transport, collocator-to-collocator connections (if required), and available cross-connects, under terms and conditions and rates set forth in Verizon VA's proposed interconnection agreements. The CLECs must provide any splitters used in a line splitting configuration. Existing rate elements for Unbundled xDSL loops, Unbundled switch ports, switch usage, and shared transport apply to this line splitting configuration. Verizon VA's proposed contract language reflects this currently available line splitting scenario.[3]

Q. HAS VERIZON VA ALWAYS PERMITTED LINE SPLITTING IN THIS MANNER?

A. Yes. Verizon VA has never precluded AT&T or WorldCom from creating a combination of an xDSL compatible loop terminated on a splitter provided by AT&T, WorldCom or another CLEC on behalf of AT&T or WorldCom and a UNE switch port in order to create line splitting that has the same voice capability as a UNE-P. Verizon VA clarified its position in a formal policy statement issued on February 14, 2001 to all CLECs, including AT&T and WorldCom. Verizon VA also has included the February 14th policy in the contract itself.[4]

---

[3] *See* Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T § 11.2.18.1; Verizon-proposed Line Splitting Addendum to WorldCom.

[4] *See id.*

Q. DESPITE THE LINE SPLITTING SCENARIO BEING AVAILABLE TODAY, DOES VERIZON VA HAVE PLANS TO IMPLEMENT LINE SPLITTING OSS ENHANCEMENTS TO FURTHER FACILITATE LINE SPLITTING IN THE STATE OF VIRGINIA?

A. Yes. These modifications will further mechanize and facilitate the ordering process and migrations for certain enhanced line splitting arrangements and migrations from line sharing to line splitting. Additional charges to recover OSS development costs may be applicable in the future after Verizon has completed its OSS development and has done a cost analysis.

Q. HOW IS THE VERIZON VA LINE SPLITTING PRODUCT BEING DEFINED?

A. The nationwide service description for Verizon's Line Splitting product is being developed based on the New York Collaborative efforts (which includes a pilot), allowing for local jurisdictional and OSS differences. The New York Public Service Commission and the CLECs are actively participating in this collaborative effort. Verizon's commitment to implement a standardized line splitting product throughout the Verizon footprint, including Virginia, will be consistent with the timeframe, terms, conditions, and guidelines agreed upon in the New York Collaborative, which are incorporated by reference in Verizon VA's proposed contract language.[5] Exhibits ASP-5 and 6, Line Splitting on All Copper Loops Future View depicts this future arrangement.

---

[5] *See id.*

Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE HISTORY OF THE NEW YORK DSL COLLABORATIVE?

A. Yes. Even before release of the *Line Sharing Reconsideration Order* in January 2001, Verizon was working with CLECs in the New York DSL Collaborative to define the business relationships, rules and practices that provide the requirements for DSL capable unbundled loops, line sharing, and more recently, the development of OSS capabilities for line splitting. The DSL Collaborative has been an active working group for over two years, and consists of representatives from the New York Public Service Commission, the CLEC community—including AT&T and WorldCom—and Verizon.

Unlike line sharing, in a line splitting arrangement Verizon VA itself controls neither the voice nor data portion of the loop. Therefore, issues concerning relationships and practices between the voice and data CLECs needed to be defined by an industry forum such as the New York Collaborative before system requirements and subsequent development and implementation in Verizon's OSS can be accomplished. Once these new OSS capabilities are in place, voice and data CLECs will be able to submit newly developed line splitting orders that support the business scenarios defined by the New York Collaborative. Verizon VA will implement any line splitting operational arrangements that are agreed upon by the parties to the New York Collaborative, subject to local regulatory approval and local OSS differences.

The New York Collaborative has been working to define the ordering processes that will support migration from a UNE-P arrangement or a line sharing arrangement to a line splitting arrangement in as automated a manner as possible. Under the supervision of the New York Commission, the Collaborative has agreed on an implementation schedule for these line splitting-specific OSS capabilities. Under this schedule, Verizon began conducting a pilot in New York in June 2001 using new OSS functionality to add data to UNE platforms in a line splitting arrangement while re-using the same network elements, including the loop, if it is DSL-capable. Verizon is targeting October 2001 the new OSS capability for Virginia that will support transitions from line sharing to line splitting arrangements consistent with the business processes and timelines defined in the New York Collaborative.

V. ISSUES RELATING TO DSL SERVICE OVER COPPER NETWORK

(Issue III-10)

A. LOOP QUALIFICATION

Q. CAN YOU COMMENT ON AT&T's LOOP QUALIFICATION DATA PROPOSAL?

A. AT&T vaguely implies that Verizon VA does not provide adequate loop qualification data, and seeks at its option to use any loop pre-qualification methods conceivably available to Verizon VA.[6] AT&T seeks access to loop qualification information to the same extent as Verizon VA, its affiliates, or any

---

6 *AT&T Petition* at 164 and AT&T interconnection agreement Schedule 11.2.17 § 1.3.1.

other unaffiliated carrier, regardless of how that information resides in Verizon VA's network.[7]

Q. DOES VERIZON VA PROVIDE CLECS WITH ADEQUATE LOOP QUALIFICATION DATA FOR PROVIDING xDSL SERVICE?

A. Yes. The Commission has twice found that Verizon VA's proposed language provides "nondiscriminatory access to OSS pre-ordering functions associated with determining whether a loop is capable of supporting xDSL technologies."[8]

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN VERIZON VA'S PROPOSAL FOR PROVIDING CLECS WITH LOOP QUALIFICATION DATA.

A. As in New York and Massachusetts, Verizon VA's proposed contract language permits a CLEC to access loop qualification information in one of three ways.[9]

First, Verizon provides access to a mechanized loop qualification database in compliance with Commission requirements to meet CLEC needs in providing xDSL loops.[10] This database provides information relevant to whether a particular loop is qualified to provide the xDSL service the CLEC wants to provide. This is the same database that is used by Verizon Advanced Data Inc. (VADI). AT&T may utilize this mechanized loop qualification database, where available, prior to submitting an electronic order for line sharing.

---

7 AT&T interconnection agreement § 11.2.2.5.

8 *NY Verizon § 271 Order* ¶ 140; *see also MA Verizon § 271 Order* ¶ 60.

9 *See* Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T § 11.2.12.2; Verizon-proposed agreement to WorldCom § 3.14 of UNE Attachment. This is the same language approved in the *MA Verizon* § 271 Order at ¶¶ 55-60.

Second, if AT&T chooses not to use the mechanized loop qualification database, Verizon VA will make loop qualification information available through either a manual loop qualification, or by a third means, an Engineering Query.[11] These processes may involve MLT testing, access to electronically-stored loop make-up information, and a review of paper records ("cable plats"). Verizon VA can access paper plant location records from various engineering offices throughout the region, obtain the requested information, and present it back to AT&T within the time specified by the *UNE Remand Order*. Again, this same process applies to VADI.

Q. ARE THERE ADDITIONAL METHODS FOR AT&T TO ACCESS LOOP QUALIFICATION DATA BEYOND THE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT?

A. Yes. In addition to the three methods of access offered by Verizon VA's proposed interconnection agreement, Verizon VA has made a bulk loop qualification method available to CLECs who request information in a bulk format. This information is available by central office and is available in an electronic format. AT&T may obtain this bulk information by entering into a separate licensing agreement with Verizon VA.

Q. DOES VERIZON VA PLAN TO MAKE ANY OTHER METHOD OF ACCESS TO LOOP QUALIFICATION DATA AVAILABLE TO AT&T IN THE FUTURE?

---

[10] *See MA Verizon* § 271 Order.

A. Yes. In the New York Collaborative, some CLECs have expressed interest in obtaining electronic access to the limited loop make-up information contained in a back office inventory system known as Loop Facilities Assignment Control System (LFACS). LFACS is primarily a loop inventory and assignment system for voice grade service that contains limited loop make-up information. As Verizon has explained to the CLECs in the New York Collaborative, the percentage of terminals for which LFACS contains at least one loop make-up (not the percentage of loops for which LFACS contains loop make-up information, nor the percentage of terminals that contain a complete loop make-up from the central office to the customer address) is limited. At the terminal level, the loop make-up represents the make-up of a single loop and does not necessarily represent the characteristics of any other loops in that terminal. Further, loop make-ups can change during the normal course of engineering the network.

Verizon voluntarily offered in ongoing collaborative proceedings in New York to provide CLECs with electronic access to the loop make-up information in this system, provided that the CLECs agree on an approach and reimburse Verizon for development costs. While none of the CLECs indicated that they wanted Verizon to proceed on these terms, in an effort to accommodate these carrier-customers, Verizon has moved ahead to develop and deploy a pre-order process to provide CLECs with electronic access to the limited loop make-up information that is currently stored in LFACs. An interim process is currently in place whereby a

[11] *See* Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T § 11.2.12.2; Verizon-proposed agreement to WorldCom § 3.14 of UNE Attachment.

CLEC can submit an electronic request for loop make-up information and will receive an electronic response within 24 hours. The response will either contain the loop make-up information as it appears in LFACS or will indicate that the requested information does not exist. A new electronic pre-order transaction that will provide this information on a real-time basis was presented by Verizon to the CLEC Change Management forum in January 2001 and is scheduled for implementation in October 2001.

Once this long term solution has been implemented, and costs and prices developed, Verizon VA will amend its interconnection agreements with AT&T to include access to LFACs data. Until the long term process can be fully developed, however, it is premature to negotiate the specific contract language at this time.

Q. SHOULD AT&T BE PERMITTED TO DECIDE AT ITS SOLE DISCRETION WHETHER IT WILL USE VERIZON VA'S PRE-QUALIFICATION PROCESS TO INDIVIDUALLY QUALIFY LOOPS TO PROVIDE ADVANCED SERVICES?

A. No. If Verizon VA's pre-qualification tools are utilized, and pre-qualification information has been returned from Verizon VA to AT&T, then AT&T has the means and information required to decide whether or not to provide advanced services to its customers. AT&T should not be permitted to use its pre-qualification tools instead of those developed by Verizon VA to make this determination. The existing loop qualification methods and tools developed have

been implemented on the basis of the consensus of all parties and collectively meet the CLECs' needs for pre-qualifying loops for DSL. Moreover, a number of the processes and programs developed have been as a result of direct CLEC intervention and request. Verizon VA accordingly has invested significant amounts of time and money into modifying its systems and building new capabilities. It should not now be required to expend more resources to accommodate just one CLEC in an idiosyncratic manner that is not required under applicable law. Consistent utilization of the database by all CLECs ensures that Verizon delivers the specific xDSL loop that each CLEC requests.

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON AT&T'S PROPOSAL REGARDING QUALIFICATION OF LOOPS PREVIOUSLY USED TO PROVIDE ADVANCED SERVICES.

A. AT&T requests that if a loop has previously been used by another carrier to provide service in the high frequency spectrum (HFS), then Verizon VA should be responsible if the loop fails to meet the operating parameters of the loop.[12] However, AT&T proposes inconsistent contract language on this point. In its proposed Schedule 11.2.17, § 1.3.3, AT&T states:

> Verizon shall be responsible for assuring the loop can support service in the HFS regardless of whether or not AT&T performs a pre-qualification of the Loop. When AT&T opts not to perform Loop pre-qualification on a Loop employed in Line Splitting and the Loop was not previously pre-qualified and/or conditioned, AT&T will not hold Verizon responsible for service performance in the HFS unless and until the Loop is qualified according to then-current Verizon Loops qualification procedures.

[12] *AT&T Petition* at 177.

Should AT&T opt not to pre-qualify a loop, and that loop fails to support service in the HFS, Verizon VA will be held responsible under the first sentence, but will not necessarily be responsible under the conditions stated in the second sentence. Thus, the absolute nature of the allocation of responsibility in the first sentence is not consistent with the conditional nature of responsibility in the second sentence.

Q. ONCE A LOOP IS USED TO PROVIDE ADVANCED SERVICES, IS IT AUTOMATICALLY QUALIFIED TO PROVIDE ANY ADVANCED SERVICE AT ANY TIME?

A. No. Verizon VA would agree that a loop that has been pre-qualified for one advanced data service will be pre-qualified for the *same* advanced data service in the same time period (*i.e.* the loop has been in continuous use for the same service). However, pre-qualification for one type of advanced data service does not automatically pre-qualify that loop for another type of advanced data service. Nor does it guarantee that the same loop will still be qualified sometime later if the original service has been discontinued, for the network might have been upgraded or changed in the interim. Verizon has received trouble reports from DLECs even when an xDSL capable loop is pre-qualified on a loop that has previously been used by another DLEC for the provisioning of xDSL. Because not all carriers use the same technology, a loop that can provide data service for one carrier may not be able to provide service for another. By eliminating the pre-qualification process for loops already providing advanced services, Verizon VA will receive unnecessary trouble reports, causing it to operate in an inefficient

manner. This will direct resources from customers who really need assistance, and will unfairly expose Verizon VA to financial penalties due to delays in repairing real problems. In addition, eliminating the pre-qualification process would require OSS modifications since Verizon VA's systems are currently designed to require a pre-qualification on advanced services such as Line Sharing and Line Splitting.

B. LINE SHARING PROVISIONING INTERVALS

Q. WHAT PROVISIONING INTERVALS WILL APPLY TO LINE SHARING?

A. On March 29, 2001, Verizon notified all CLECs that effective May 1st Verizon will shorten its standard interval for provisioning line sharing orders on five or fewer arrangements to three business days in all Verizon-East jurisdictions for loops that do not require conditioning or facility modifications. Thus, Verizon VA has amended its proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T to reflect this interval.[13]

Verizon VA and AT&T are still negotiating the intervals for collocation augments necessary to permit line sharing, and may be able to reach an agreement. Verizon VA reserves the right to supplement this testimony in the event the Parties cannot reach agreement.

[13] Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to AT&T § 11.2.17.2 (vi); Verizon-proposed interconnection agreement to WorldCom § 4.4.6 of UNE Attachment.

C. SPLITTER PLACEMENT

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON AT&T'S SPLITTER PLACEMENT PROPOSALS.

A. AT&T proposes to require Verizon VA to place splitters in shared common areas or to permit AT&T to place splitters "in any type of collocation."[14] However, requiring an ILEC to place splitters in any particular place has been rejected as a matter of law. In *GTE Services Corp.*,[15] the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia overturned Commission rules that would have given CLECs the right to designate where equipment can be collocated in an ILEC's central office. In vacating the Commission's rules, the Court held that the ILEC, not the CLEC, has the right to determine where equipment is collocated in the ILEC's facilities. Thus, AT&T is not entitled to dictate that location in Verizon VA's central office, and its proposed language must therefore be rejected.

D. SPLITTER OWNERSHIP

Q. DOES VERIZON VA OFFER A VERIZON-OWNED SPLITTER OPTION FOR LINE SHARING OR LINE SPLITTING?

A. No. In its *Line Sharing Order*, the Commission did not require ILECs to own and provide splitters to CLECs. Rather ownership is a discretionary right of the ILEC, not an obligation. This is consistent with the Act, which only imposes a duty on local exchange carriers to provide "for physical collocation of equipment necessary for . . . access to unbundled network elements at the premises of the

---

14 *AT&T Petition* at 178.

15 *GTE Services Corp. v.* FCC, 205 F.3d 416 (D.C. Cir. 2000) ("*GTE Services Corp.*").

local exchange carrier." Likewise, nothing in the *Line Sharing Order* gives the CLEC the right to dictate ownership of a splitter.

Verizon VA has no obligation to assume the expense and risk of buying splitters (or any other equipment for that matter) in order to turn them over to CLECs for their use. Requiring Verizon VA to provide splitters for CLECs would place the burden of assuming the capital costs of buying, installing, and inventorying splitters upon Verizon VA and would pass on to Verizon VA the costs and risks should the CLECs decide at some future date not to continue to use the particular type of splitter that Verizon VA has stocked in inventory. This kind of obligation goes well beyond the Act's market-opening requirements for access to the ILEC's existing, functioning network. In addition, requiring Verizon VA to purchase and own such splitters to be used by an individual CLEC would be economically unsound, and administratively inefficient and cumbersome.

There would also be financial implications as CLECs migrate to newer, more technologically advanced splitter products and other means of providing advanced services, such as cable modems, which make up a large percentage of this market. As a result, Verizon VA would inevitably and unfairly be left with stranded splitter investment.

Q. DO DECISIONS FROM THE COMMISSION OR THE STATES SUPPORT YOUR STATEMENTS ABOVE ON THE ISSUE OF OWNERSHIP OF SPLITTERS IN LINE SHARING ARRANGEMENTS?

A. Yes. Commission decisions in California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, and Washington all reached the same conclusions regarding ownership of the splitter. In California, the arbitrator concluded that "[w]hile a menu of choices may be optimal from the point of view of the CLECs, it is neither required by the Commission, nor is it reasonable." Final Arbitrator's Decision, at 21. The California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, and Washington decisions found that the ILEC had no obligation to assume the financial and technology risks associated with owning splitters. The Commission, in approving SBC Communications' § 271 application, clearly stated that an ILEC does not have an obligation to make a splitter available in line sharing arrangements. Even if the Commission were to require that ILECs purchase and own splitters for use by CLECs, there would still have to be a "necessary and impair" standard test passed before splitters could be considered UNEs. That test could not be met because CLECs are perfectly capable of providing their own splitters, and are doing so today.

Q. DOES THIS SAME ANALYSIS APPLY TO SPLITTER OWNERSHIP IN A LINE SPLITTING SCENARIO?

A. Yes. The same two splitter options offered for line sharing arrangements are available to CLECs for line splitting: (i) a CLEC may purchase its choice of approved and NEBs (Network Equipment Building System Requirements) compliant splitters and may install the splitters with their collocation space or (ii)

a CLEC-purchased splitter may be installed in Verizon VA's central office space in a virtual collocation arrangement.

If Verizon VA were required to own splitters for line splitting or line sharing, equipment compatibility issues would be compounded because multiple CLECs may want to use the same Verizon VA splitter on a line-at-a-time basis and all splitters do not work with different CLEC DSLAMs. Thus, Verizon VA would likely have to buy and maintain a variety of splitters to match diverse CLEC equipment. Such a requirement is unreasonable, inefficient, and unnecessary. Although some CLECs claim that it is beneficial to have shared splitters (a claim which is unsubstantiated), and then tag Verizon VA with the ownership responsibility for those shared splitters, there is no valid reason that Verizon VA should have to buy the common equipment for everyone else to use. Verizon VA should not be placed in the position of having to purchase new equipment and bear the additional investment costs and risks for the CLECs, especially in this area of fast-changing technology.

In addition to the issues presented above, there would be additional and more complex administrative and operational problems associated with ILEC owned splitters in line splitting scenarios. Movement of customers from one voice CLEC to another and from one data LEC to another would be more complicated. Significant wiring and re-wiring problems could arise between the xDSL equipment and the MDF. This leg of the arrangement does not have dial tone or

electronic signatures that can ensure that the wiring is complete or wired accurately. Re-wiring between Verizon VA splitters and CLEC splitters would become commonplace.

In an ILEC-owned splitter configuration, hard wiring of the cable from the splitter to the DSLAM would not be possible. (Hard wiring reduces incomplete or inaccurate wiring issues.) The data leg would have to be wired a line at a time, which would create testing problems.

The ordering process including Cable Assignments would require new and different assignment processes than those in place today. Finally, because the splitter should be designed to match the CLEC DSLAM and be specified by the DLEC, the creation of unique inventories and types would undermine any effort for minimizing complexity. New splitter designs would also add to churn and inventory and assignment issues.

These issues, which are common to line sharing and line splitting, cancel out any possible value of an ILEC-owned splitter as a third splitter option – even if that option could be required, which it cannot. As a result, Verizon VA will offer line splitting utilizing either the CLEC purchased, physical collocation option or the CLEC purchased, virtual collocation option for splitter ownership and placement.

VI. CURRENT DLC AND NGDLC INCLUDED IN THE VIRGINIA NETWORK

(Issues III-10, IV-28, and V-6)